IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

(1) Crim.Appln.No.830 of 2005
(2) Crim.Appln.No.831 of 2005
(3) Crim.Appln.No.832 of 2005
(4) Crim.Appln.No.835 of 2005
(5) Crim.Appln.No.836 of 2005
(6) Crim.Appln.No.838 of 2005
(7) Crim.Appln.No.839 of 2005
(8) Crim.Appln.No.840 of 2005
(9) Crim.Appln.No.841 of 2005
(10)Crim.Appln.No.843 of 2005
(11)Crim.Appln.No.844 of 2005
(12)Crim.Appln.No.845 of 2005
(13)Crim.Appln.No.846 of 2005
(14)Crim.Appln.No.849 of 2005
(15)Crim.Appln.No.850 of 2005
(16)Crim.Appln.No.852 of 2005
(17)Crim.Appln.No.853 of 2005
(18)Crim.Appln.No.856 of 2005
(19)Crim.Appln.No.857 of 2005
(20)Crim.Appln.No.858 of 2005
(21)Crim.Appln.No.859 of 2005
(22)Crim.Appln.No.1229 of 2005
(23)Crim.Appln.No.1230 of 2005
(24) Crim.Appln.No.1231 of 2005
(25) Crim.Appln.No.1232 of 2005
(26) Crim.Appln.No.1233 of 2005
(27) Crim.Appln.No.1234 of 2005
(28) Crim.Appln.No.1235 of 2005
(29) Crim.Appln.No.1308 of 2005
(30) Crim.Appln.No.1309 of 2005
(31) Crim.Appln.No.1310 of 2005
(32) Crim.Appln.No.1311 of 2005
(33) Crim.Appln.No.1313 of 2005
(34) Crim.Appln.No.1314 of 2005
(35) Crim.Appln.No.1318 of 2005

Tulsi Banbiharilal Goyal ..Petitioner

vs.

State of Maharashtra & anr. ..Respondents.

Shri A.M.Saraogi for petitioner in all petitions.
Smt.S.V.Gajare, A.P.P. for respondent State in Crim.Appln.Nos.830, 831, 832, 835, 836, and 838 of 2005
Shri Rajesh More, A.P.P. for respondent State in Crim.Appln.Nos.839, 840, 841, 843, 844, and 845 of 2005
Smt.G.P.Mulekar, A.P.P. for respondent State in Crim,.Appln.Nos.845, 846, 849, 850, 852, and 853 of

2005 Smt.Deshmukh, A.P.P. for respondent State in Crim.Appln.Nos.856, 857, 858 and 859 of 2005.
Shri Y.S.Shinde, A.P.P.for respondent State in Crim.Appln.Nos.1229, 1230, 1231, 1232, 1233, and 1234 of 2005.
Smt.M.H.Mhatre, A.P.P. for respondent State in Crim.Appln.Nos.125, 1308, 1309, 1310, and 1311 of 2005
Smt.R.M.Gadhavi, A.P.P. for respondent State in Crim.Appln..No.1311, 1313, 1314 and 1318 of 2005.

**CORAM: A.M.KHANWILKAR J.**
**22nd December,2005**

**P.C.**

1. Heard. The grounds raised before this court can be effectively answered by the Revisional Court.

1. As alternative efficacious remedy is available to the applicants by way of revision before the Sessions Court in view of the decision of this Court in case of V.K.Jain and others Vs. Pratap V.Padode reported in 2005(3) Mh.L.J. 778, and unreported decision of this court in Criminal W.P.No.1023 of 2005 dated 8th December, 2005 in the case of Chetan R.Nagda and Ors. Vs.N.D.Pawar and anr., counsel for the applicant fairlay prays for withdrawal of the application with liberty to take recourse to remedy of revision. Hence, dismissed as withdrawn with liberty as prayed. All questions are left open.

3. The applicant to file such revision application within four weeks from today. Till such time, no precipitative action be taken against the applicant. Revision Application, if filed within four weeks from today, be considered on its own merits in accordance with law.

4. In case, there is any delay in filing Revision Application, Court will take into account the fact that the petitioner had first approached this Court, which period may be excused in computing delay.

5. Application disposed of on the above terms.